arXiv:1503.07448v1 [math.AP] 25 Mar 2015

1-Dimensional Harnack Estimates

Fatma Gamze Düzgün
Hacettepe University
06800, Beytepe, Ankara, Turkey
email: `gamzeduz@hacettepe.edu.tr`

Ugo Gianazza
Dipartimento di Matematica "F. Casorati", Università di Pavia
via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy
email: `gianazza@imati.cnr.it`

Vincenzo Vespri
Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica "U. Dini"
Università di Firenze
viale Morgagni 67/A, 50134 Firenze, Italy
email: `vespri@math.unifi.it`

Dedicated to the memory of our friend Alfredo Lorenzi

Abstract

Let u be a non-negative super-solution to a 1-dimensional singular parabolic equation of p-Laplacian type ($1 < p < 2$). If u is bounded below on a time-segment $\{y\} \times (0, T]$ by a positive number M, then it has a power-like decay of order $\frac{p}{2-p}$ with respect to the space variable x in $\mathbb{R} \times [T/2, T]$. This fact, stated quantitatively in Proposition 1.1, is a "sidewise spreading of positivity" of solutions to such singular equations, and can be considered as a form of Harnack inequality. The proof of such an effect is based on geometrical ideas.

AMS Subject Classification (2010): Primary 35K65, 35B65; Secondary 35B45

Key Words: Singular diffusion equations, p-laplacian, Expansion of positivity.

1 Introduction

Let $E = (\alpha, \beta)$ and define $E_{-\tau_o,T} = E \times (-\tau_o, T]$, for τ_o, $T > 0$. Consider the non-linear diffusion equation

$$u_t - (|u_x|^{p-2} u_x)_x = 0, \qquad 1 < p < 2. \tag{1.1}$$

A function

$$u \in C_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(-\tau_o, T; L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(E)\big) \cap L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(-\tau_o, T; W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(E)\big) \tag{1.2}$$

is a local, weak super-solution to (1.1), if for every compact set $K \subset E$ and every sub-interval $[t_1, t_2] \subset (-\tau_o, T]$

$$\int_K u\varphi dx \bigg|_{t_1}^{t_2} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_K \big[-u\varphi_t + |u_x|^{p-2} u_x \, \varphi_x \big] dxdt \ge 0 \tag{1.3}$$

for all non-negative test functions

$$\varphi \in W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(-\tau_o, T; L^2(K)\big) \cap L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(-\tau_o, T; W^{1,p}_o(K)\big).$$

This guarantees that all the integrals in (1.3) are convergent. These equations are termed singular since, for $1 < p < 2$, the modulus of ellipticity $|u_x|^{p-2} \to \infty$ as $|u_x| \to 0$.

Remark 1.1 Since we are working with local solutions, we consider the domain $E_{-\tau_o,T} = E \times (-\tau_o, T]$, instead of dealing with the more natural $E_T = E \times (0, T]$, in order to avoid problems with the initial conditions. The only role played by $\tau_o > 0$ is precisely to get rid of any difficulty at $t = 0$, and its precise value plays no role in the argument to follow.

Proposition 1.1 *Let u be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1) *in $E_{-\tau_o,T}$, in the sense of* (1.2)–(1.3)*, satisfying*

$$u(y,t) > M \quad \forall t \in (0, \frac{T}{2}] \tag{1.4}$$

for some $y \in E$, and for some $M > 0$. Let $\bar\rho \overset{def}{=} \Big(\frac{2^{2-p} T}{M^{2-p}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, take $\rho \ge 4\bar\rho$, and assume that

$$B_\rho(\bar x) \subset B_{4\rho}(y) \subset E, \qquad \textit{where} \ \ \mathrm{dist}(\bar x, y) = 2\rho.$$

There exists $\bar\sigma \in (0,1)$, that can be determined a priori, quantitatively only in terms of the data, and independent of M and T, such that

$$u(x,t) \ge \bar\sigma M \left(\frac{\bar\rho}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \qquad \textit{for all} \ \ (x,t) \in B_\rho(\bar x) \times [\frac{T}{4}, \frac{T}{2}] \tag{1.5}$$

1.1 Novelty and Significance

The measure theoretical information on the "positivity set" in $\{y\} \times (0, \frac{T}{2}]$ implies that such a positivity set actually "expands" sidewise in $\mathbb{R} \times [\frac{T}{4}, \frac{T}{2}]$, with a power-like decay of order $\frac{p}{2-p}$ with respect to the space variable x. Although considered a sort of natural fact, to our knowledge this result has never been proven before; it is the analogue of the power-like decay of order $\frac{1}{p-2}$ with respect to the time variable t, known in the degenerate setting $p > 2$ (see [2], [3, Chapter 4, Section 4], [7]). As the $t^{-\frac{1}{p-2}}$-decay is at the heart of the Harnack estimate for $p > 2$, so Proposition 1.1 could be used to give a more streamlined proof of the Harnack inequality in the singular, super-critical range $\frac{2N}{N+1} < p < 2$. This will be the object of future work, where we plan to address the general N-dimensional case.

The proof is based on geometrical ideas, originally introduced in two different contexts: the energy estimates of § 2 and the decay of § 3 rely on a method introduced in [8] in order to prove the Hölder continuity of solutions to an anisotropic elliptic equation, and further developed in [5, 6]; the change of variable used in the actual proof of Proposition 1.1 was used in [4].

1.2 Further Generalization

Consider partial differential equations of the form

$$u_t - (\mathbf{A}(x,t,u,u_x))_x = 0 \qquad \text{weakly in } E_{-\tau_o,T}, \tag{1.6}$$

where the function $\mathbb{A} : E_{-\tau_o,T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is only assumed to be measurable and subject to the structure condition

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{A}(x,t,u,u_x)\, u_x \geq C_o |u_x|^p \\ |\mathbf{A}(x,t,u,u_x)| \leq C_1 |u_x|^{p-1} \end{array} \right. \qquad \text{a.e. in } E_{-\tau_o,T}, \tag{1.7}$$

where $1 < p < 2$, C_o and C_1 are given positive constants. It is not hard to show that Proposition 1.1 holds also for weak super-solutions to (1.6)–(1.7), since our proof is entirely based on the structural properties of (1.1), and the explicit dependence on u_x plays no role. However, to keep the exposition simple, we have limited ourselves to the prototype case.

2 Energy Estimates

Let u be a non-negative bounded, weak super-solution in $E_{-\tau_o,T}$, assume

$$0 \leq \mu_- = \inf_{E_{-\tau_o,T}} u,$$

and let ω be a positive parameter. Without loss of generality we may assume that $0 \in (\alpha, \beta)$. For ρ sufficiently small, so that $(-\rho,\rho) \subset (\alpha,\beta)$, let

$$B_\rho = (-\rho,\rho), \qquad Q = B_\rho \times (0,T],$$

$B_\rho(y) = (y-\rho, y+\rho), \qquad Q(y) = B_\rho(y) \times (0, T],$
$a \in (0,1), \quad H \in (0,1]$ parameters that will be fixed in the following,
$A = \{(x,t) \in Q(y) : \ u(x,t) < \mu_- + (1-a)H\omega\}.$

Proposition 2.1 *Let u be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1) *in $E_{-\tau_o,T}$, in the sense of* (1.2)–(1.3). *There exists a positive constant $\gamma = \gamma(p)$, such that for every cylinder $Q(y) = B_\rho(y) \times (0,T] \subset E_{-\tau_o,T}$, and every piecewise smooth, cutoff function ζ vanishing on $\partial B_\rho(y)$, such that $0 \le \zeta \le 1$, and $\zeta_t \le 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\rho(y)\cap(A\times\{0\})} \left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p} - \frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right] \zeta^p(x,0)\,dx \\ &+ \iint_{Q(y)\cap A} \frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p} \zeta^p \,dxdt \le \gamma \iint_{Q(y)\cap A} |\zeta_x|^p \,dxdt \\ &+ \gamma \iint_{Q(y)\cap A} (u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p} \zeta^{p-1} |\zeta_t| \,dxdt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Proof - Without loss of generality, we may assume $y = 0$. In the weak formulation of (1.1) take $\varphi = G(u)\zeta^p$ as test function, with

$$G(u) = \left[\frac{1}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{p-1}} - \frac{1}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]_+,$$

and $\zeta = \zeta_1(x)\zeta_2(t)$, where ζ_1 vanishes outside B_ρ and satisfies

$$0 \le \zeta_1 \le 1, \qquad \zeta_1 = 1 \text{ in } B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}, \qquad |\partial_x \zeta_1| \le \frac{\gamma_1}{\rho}, \tag{2.2}$$

for an absolute constant γ_1 independent of ρ, and ζ_2 is monotone decreasing, and satisfies

$$0 \le \zeta_2 \le 1, \qquad \zeta_2 = 1 \text{ in } (0, \frac{T}{2}], \qquad \zeta_2 = 0 \text{ for } t \ge T, \qquad |\partial_t \zeta_2| \le \frac{\gamma_2}{T}, \tag{2.3}$$

for an absolute constant γ_2 independent of T. It is easy to see that we have

$$G'(u) = -\frac{p-1}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\, \chi_A.$$

Modulo a Steklov averaging process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_Q u_t G(u) \zeta^p \,dxdt \\ &+ \iint_Q \zeta^p G'(u) |u_x|^p \,dxdt + p \iint_Q G(u)\, |u_x|^{p-2} \zeta^{p-1} u_x \cdot \zeta_x dxdt \ge 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(p-1)\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt\\
&\le p\iint_{Q\cap A}\zeta^{p-1}\frac{|u_x|^{p-1}}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{p-1}}|\zeta_x|\,dxdt\\
&+\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{u_t}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{p-1}}\zeta^p\,dxdt-\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{u_t}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\zeta^p\,dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(p-1)\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt\\
&\le p\iint_{Q\cap A}\zeta^{p-1}\frac{|u_x|^{p-1}}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{p-1}}|\zeta_x|\,dxdt\\
&+\iint_{Q\cap A}\partial_t\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^p\,dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(p-1)\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt\\
&\le p\iint_{Q\cap A}\zeta^{p-1}\frac{|u_x|^{p-1}}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{p-1}}|\zeta_x|\,dxdt\\
&+\int_{B_\rho\cap(A\times\{T\})}\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^p(x,T)\,dx\\
&-\int_{B_\rho\cap(A\times\{0\})}\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^p(x,0)\,dx\\
&-p\iint_{Q\cap A}\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^{p-1}\zeta_t\,dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right-hand side vanishes, as $\zeta(x,T)=0$. Therefore, an application of Young's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&(p-1)\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt\\
&+\int_{B_\rho\cap(A\times\{0\})}\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^p(x,0)\,dx\\
&\le\frac{p-1}{2}\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt+\gamma\iint_{Q\cap A}|\zeta_x|^p\,dxdt\\
&+p\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}\zeta^{p-1}|\zeta_t|\,dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have taken into account that $\zeta_t \le 0$. Therefore, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_\rho\cap(A\times\{0\})}\left[\frac{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}}{2-p}-\frac{u}{(\omega H)^{p-1}}\right]\zeta^p(x,0)\,dx\\
&+\frac{p-1}{2}\iint_{Q\cap A}\frac{|u_x|^p}{(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^p}\zeta^p\,dxdt\le\gamma\iint_{Q\cap A}|\zeta_x|^p\,dxdt \qquad (2.4)\\
&+\gamma\iint_{Q\cap A}(u-\mu_-+a\omega H)^{2-p}\zeta^{p-1}|\zeta_t|\,dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first term on the left-hand side is non–negative, since for $0 < s < 1-a < 1$ the function $f(s) = \frac{(s+a)^{2-p}}{t}$ is monotone decreasing, and $f(1-a) = \frac{1}{1-a} > 1$. ■

Remark 2.1 The constant γ deteriorates, as $p \to 1$.

Remark 2.2 Even though in the next Section H basically plays no role, we chose to state the previous Proposition with an explicit dependence also on H for future applications.

3 A Decay Lemma

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mu_- = 0$. Let $M = \omega$, $L \le \frac{M}{2}$, and suppose that

$$u(0,t) > M \quad \forall t \in (0,\frac{T}{2}]. \qquad (3.1)$$

Now, let s_o be an integer to be chosen, and define

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{s_o} &= \{t\in(0,\frac{T}{2}]:\ \exists x\in B_{\frac{\varrho}{2}},\ u(x,t)<\frac{L}{2^{s_o}}\}\\
A(t) &= \{x\in B_{\frac{\varrho}{2}}:\ u(x,t)<L(1-\frac{1}{2^{s_o}})\}, \qquad t\in(0,\frac{T}{2}]\\
A &= \left\{(x,t)\in B_{\frac{\varrho}{2}}\times(0,\frac{T}{2}]:\ u(x,t)<L(1-\frac{1}{2^{s_o}})\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1 *Let u be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1) *in $E_{-\tau_o,T}$, in the sense of* (1.2)–(1.3)*. Let* (3.1) *hold and take*

$$L \le \min\{\frac{M}{2},\left(\frac{T}{\rho^p}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}}\}.$$

Then, for any $\nu \in (0,1)$, there exists a positive integer s_o such that

$$|\{t\in(0,\frac{T}{2}]:\ \exists x\in B_{\frac{\varrho}{2}},\ u(x,t)\le\frac{L}{2^{s_o}}\}|\le\nu|(0,\frac{T}{2}]|.$$

Proof - Take $t \in A_{s_o}$: by definition, there exists $\bar{x} \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$ such that $u(\bar{x},t) < L/2^{s_o}$. On the other hand, by assumption $u(0,t) > 2L$, and therefore, $u(0,t) + (L/2^{s_o}) > L$. Hence

$$\ln_+ \frac{u(0,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}}{u(\bar{x},t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} > (s_o - 1)\ln 2,$$

and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(s_o - 1)\ln 2 &\le \ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(\bar{x},t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) - \ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(0,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\bar{x}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(\xi,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \right) d\xi \\
&\le \int_{-\frac{\rho}{2}}^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(x,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \right) \right| dx \\
&= \int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}} \cap A(t)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(x,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \right) \right| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

If we integrate with respect to time over the set A_{s_o}, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(s_o - 1)|A_{s_o}|\ln 2 &\le \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}} \cap A(t)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(x,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \right) \right| dx \\
&\le \left[\int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}} \cap A(t)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\ln_+ \left(\frac{L}{u(x,t) + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}}} \right) \right) \right|^p dxdt \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\le \left[\iint_{Q \cap A} \frac{|u_x|^p}{(u + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}})^p} \zeta^p \, dxdt \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Apply estimates (2.1) with $a = \dfrac{1}{2^{s_o}}$, $H\omega = HM = L$. The requirement $H \le 1$ is satisfied, since $L \le \frac{M}{2}$. They yield

$$\begin{aligned}
(s_o - 1)|A_{s_o}| &\le \gamma |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left[\iint_{Q \cap A} |\zeta_x|^p dxdt \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\quad + \gamma |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left[\iint_{Q \cap A} (u + \frac{L}{2^{s_o}})^{2-p} |\zeta_t| dxdt \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

With these choices, we have

$$(s_o - 1)|A_{s_o}| \le \gamma |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \frac{1}{\rho} |Q|^{\frac{1}{p}} + \gamma |Q|^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\frac{L^{2-p}}{T} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} |Q|^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

$$\leq \gamma \left[\frac{1}{\rho} + \left(\frac{L^{2-p}}{T} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] |Q|.$$

If we require $L \leq \left(\frac{T}{\rho^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}}$, and we substitute it back in the previous estimate, we have

$$(s_o - 1)|A_{s_o} \leq \gamma_1 |(0, \frac{T}{2}]|.$$

Therefore, if we want that $|A_{s_o}| \leq \nu |(0, \frac{T}{2}]|$, it is enough to require that $s_o = \frac{\gamma_1}{\nu} + 1$. ■

The previous result can also be rewritten as

Lemma 3.2 *Let* u *be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1) *in* $E_{-\tau_o,T}$*, in the sense of* (1.2)–(1.3)*. Let* (3.1) *hold. For any* $\nu \in (0,1)$*, there exists a positive integer* s_o *such that*

$$|\{t \in (0, \frac{T}{2}] : \ \exists x \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}, \ u(x,t) \leq \left(\frac{T}{\rho^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}} \frac{1}{2^{s_o}} \}| \leq \nu |(0, \frac{T}{2}]|,$$

provided $\rho > 0$ *is so large that* $\left(\frac{T}{\rho^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}} \leq \frac{M}{2}$.

Now let $\bar\rho$ be such that

$$\left(\frac{T}{\bar\rho^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}} = \frac{M}{2} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \bar\rho = \left(\frac{2^{2-p} T}{M^{2-p}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{3.2}$$

and assume that $B_{\bar\rho} \subset (\alpha, \beta)$. Then Lemmas 3.1–3.2 can be rephrased

Lemma 3.3 *Let* u *be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1) *in* $E_{-\tau_o,T}$*, in the sense of* (1.2)–(1.3)*. Let* (3.1) *hold. For any* $\nu \in (0,1)$*, there exists a positive integer* s_o *such that for any* $\rho > \bar\rho$

$$|\{t \in (0, \frac{T}{2}] : \ \exists x \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}, \ u(x,t) \leq \frac{M}{2^{s_o+1}} \left(\frac{\bar\rho}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \}| \leq \nu |(0, \frac{T}{2}]|,$$

provided that $B_\rho \subset (\alpha, \beta)$.

Remark 3.1 The previous corollary gives us the power-like decay, required in Proposition 1.1.

Let us now set $A^c_{s_o} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (0, \frac{T}{2}] \backslash A_{s_o}$. Then, if (3.1) holds, we conclude that for any $t \in A^c_{s_o}$ and for any $x \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$ with $\rho > \bar\rho$

$$u(x,t) \geq \frac{M}{2^{s_o+1}} \left(\frac{\bar\rho}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Let $c \geq 4$ denote a positive parameter, choose $\bar{x} \in (\alpha, \beta)$ such that $|\bar{x}| = 2c\bar{\rho}$, and consider $B_{c\bar{\rho}}(\bar{x})$. Then, by (3.3)

$$\forall\, x \in B_{c\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}}(\bar{x}), \quad \forall\, t \in A^c_{s_o} \quad u(x,t) \geq \frac{M}{2^{s_o+1}} \left(\frac{2}{5c}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}}, \tag{3.4}$$

provided (3.1) holds, and $B(\bar{x})_{c\bar{\rho}} \subset (\alpha, \beta)$.

4 A DeGiorgi-Type Lemma

Assume that some information is available on the “initial data” relative to the cylinder $B_{2\rho}(y) \times (s, s + \theta\rho^p]$, say for example

$$u(x,s) \geq M \qquad \text{for a.e. } \; x \in B_{2\rho}(y) \tag{4.1}$$

for some $M > 0$. Then, the following Proposition is proved in [3, Chapter 3, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 4.1 *Let u be a non-negative, local, weak super-solution to* (1.1)*, and M be a positive number such that* (4.1) *holds. Then*

$$u \geq \tfrac{1}{2}M \qquad \text{a.e. in } \; B_\rho(y) \times (s, s + \theta(2\rho)^p],$$

where

$$\theta = \delta\, M^{2-p} \tag{4.2}$$

for a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$ depending only upon p, and independent of M and ρ.

Remark 4.1 Lemma 4.1 is based on the energy estimates and Proposition 3.1 of [1], Chapter I which continue to hold in a stable manner for $p \to 1$. These results are therefore valid for all $p \geq 1$, including a seamless transition from the singular range $p < 2$ to the degenerate range $p > 2$.

5 Proof of Proposition 1.1

Fix $y \in E$, define $\bar{\rho}$ as in (3.2), and choose a positive parameter $C \geq 4$, such that the cylindrical domain

$$B_{2^{\frac{2-p}{p}} C\bar{\rho}}(y) \times \big(0, \frac{T}{2}\big] \subset E_{-\tau_o, T}. \tag{5.1}$$

This is an assumption both on the size of the reference ball $B_{2^{\frac{2-p}{p}} C\bar{\rho}}(y)$ and on T: nevertheless, we can always assume it without loss of generality. Indeed, if (5.1) were not satisfied, we would decompose the interval $(0, \frac{T}{2}]$ in smaller subintervals, each of width τ, such that (5.1) is satisfied working with $\bar{\rho}$ replaced by

$$\rho^* = \left(\frac{2^{2-p}\tau}{M^{2-p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The only role of C is in determining a sufficiently large reference domain

$$B_{2^{\frac{2-p}{p}}C\bar{\rho}}(y) \subset E,$$

which contains the smaller ball we will actually work with, and will play no other role; in particular the structural constants will not depend on C.
Now, introduce the change of variables and the new unknown function

$$z = 2^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \frac{x-y}{\bar{\rho}}, \qquad -e^{-\tau} = \frac{t - \frac{T}{2}}{\frac{T}{2}}, \qquad v(z,\tau) = \frac{1}{M} u(x,t) e^{\frac{\tau}{2-p}}. \tag{5.2}$$

This maps the cylinder in (5.1) into $B_C \times (0,\infty)$ and transforms (1.1) into

$$v_\tau - (|v_z|^{p-2} v_z)_z = \frac{1}{2-p} v \quad \text{weakly in } \; B_C \times (0,\infty). \tag{5.3}$$

The assumption (1.4) of Proposition 1.1 becomes

$$v(0,\tau) \geq e^{\frac{\tau}{2-p}} \quad \text{for all } \; \tau \in (0,+\infty). \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\tau_o > 0$ to be chosen and set

$$k = e^{\frac{\tau_o}{2-p}}.$$

With this symbolism, (5.4) implies

$$v(0,\tau) \geq k \quad \text{for all } \; \tau \in (\tau_o,+\infty). \tag{5.5}$$

Now consider the segment

$$I \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{0\} \times \big(\tau_o, \tau_o + k^{2-p}\big).$$

Let $\nu = \frac{1}{4}$ and s_o be the corresponding quantity introduced in Lemma 3.1. We can then apply Lemmas 3.1–3.3 with $T = k^{2-p}$, M substituted by k,

$$A_{s_o} = \{\tau \in (\tau_o, \tau_o + \frac{1}{2}] : \; \exists\, z \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}, \; v(z,\tau) < \frac{k}{2^{s_o+1}}\} \quad \text{for} \quad \rho > \tilde{\rho},$$

with $\tilde{\rho} \overset{\text{def}}{=} 2^{\frac{2-p}{p}}$. Therefore, if $c \geq 4$ denotes a positive parameter, we choose $\bar{z} \in B_C$ such that $|\bar{z}| = 2c\tilde{\rho}$, and consider $B_{c\tilde{\rho}}(\bar{z})$, by (3.3)

$$\forall\, z \in B_{c\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{2}}(\bar{z}), \;\; \forall\, \tau \in A_{s_o}^c \;\; v(z,\tau) \geq \frac{k}{2^{s_o+1}} \left(\frac{2}{5c}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}}, \tag{5.6}$$

provided $B(\bar{z})_{c\tilde{\rho}} \subset B_C$. Summarising, there exists at least a time level τ_1 in the range

$$\tau_o < \tau_1 < \tau_o + \frac{1}{2} k^{2-p} \tag{5.7}$$

such that

$$\forall\, z \in B_{c\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{2}}(\bar{z}), \;\; v(z,\tau_1) \geq \sigma_o e^{\frac{\tau_o}{2-p}} \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma_o = \frac{1}{2^{s_o+1}} \left(\frac{2}{5c}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}}.$$

Remark 5.1 Notice that σ_o is determined only in terms of the data and is independent of the parameter τ_o, which is still to be chosen.

5.1 Returning to the Original Coordinates

In terms of the original coordinates and the original function $u(x,t)$, this implies

$$u(\cdot,t_1)\ge \sigma_o M e^{-\frac{\tau_1-\tau_o}{2-p}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} M_o \qquad \text{in } \ B_{c\frac{\bar\rho}{2}}(\bar x)$$

where the time t_1 corresponding to τ_1 is computed from (5.2) and (5.7), and $\operatorname{dist}(\bar x,y)=2c\bar\rho$. Now, apply Lemma 4.1 with M replaced by M_o over the cylinder $B_{c\frac{\bar\rho}{2}}(\bar x)\times\big(t_1,t_1+\theta(c\bar\rho)^p\big]$. By choosing

$$\theta=\delta M_o^{2-p} \qquad \text{where} \qquad \delta=\delta(\text{data}),$$

the assumption (4.2) is satisfied, and Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} u(\cdot,t) &\ge \tfrac12 M_o=\tfrac12\sigma_o M e^{-\frac{\tau_1-\tau_o}{2-p}} \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2^{s_o+2}}\left(\frac{2}{5c}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} e^{-\frac{2}{2-p}e^{\tau_o}} M \end{aligned} \qquad \text{in} \quad B_{c\bar\rho}(\bar x) \tag{5.8}$$

for all times

$$t_1\le t\le t_1+\delta\frac{1}{2^{s_o(2-p)}}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{p} e^{-(\tau_1-\tau_o)}\frac{T}{2}. \tag{5.9}$$

Notice that (5.8) can be rewritten as

$$u(\cdot,t)\ge\bar\sigma\left(\frac{\bar\rho}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} M \text{ in} \quad B_\rho(\bar x), \tag{5.10}$$

with

$$\bar\sigma \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{s_o+2}}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}} e^{-\frac{2}{2-p}e^{\tau_o}} \tag{5.11}$$

If the right hand side of (5.9) equals $\frac{T}{2}$, then (5.8) holds for all times in

$$\big(\frac{T}{2}-\varepsilon M^{2-p}(c\bar\rho)^p\,,\,\frac{T}{2}\big] \qquad \text{where} \quad \varepsilon=\delta\sigma_o^{2-p}e^{-e^{\tau_o}}; \tag{5.12}$$

taking into account the expression for $\bar\rho$ and σ_o, we conclude that (5.8) holds for all times in

$$\big(\frac{T}{2}-e^{-e^{\tau_o}}\frac{\delta}{2^{s_o(2-p)}}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^p\frac{T}{2}\,,\,\frac{T}{2}\big]. \tag{5.13}$$

Thus, the conclusion of Proposition 1.1 holds, provided the upper time level in (5.9) equals $\frac{T}{2}$. The transformed τ_o level is still undetermined, and it will be so chosen as to verify such a requirement. Precisely, taking into account (5.2)

$$\frac{T}{2}e^{-\tau_1}=-(t_1-\frac{T}{2})=\delta\frac{1}{2^{s_o(2-p)}}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^p e^{-(\tau_1-\tau_o)}\frac{T}{2} \implies e^{\tau_o}=\left(\frac{5}{2}\right)^p\frac{2^{s_o(2-p)}}{\delta}.$$

This determines quantitatively $\tau_o=\tau_o(\text{data})$, and inserting such a τ_o on the right-hand side of (5.11) and (5.13), yields a bound below that depends only on the data; (5.11) and (5.13) have been obtained relying on the bound below for u along the segment $\{y\}\times(0,\frac{T}{2}]$. However, the same argument on the bound along the shorter segment $\{y\}\times(0,s]$ for any $\frac{T}{4}\le s<\frac{T}{2}$ yields the same result with $\frac{T}{2}$ substituted by s: the proof of Proposition 1.1 is then completed. ■

5.2 A Remark about the Limit as $p \to 2$

The change of variables (5.2) and the subsequent arguments, yield constants that deteriorate as $p \to 2$. This is no surprise, as the decay of solutions to linear parabolic equations is not power-like, but rather exponential-like, as in the fundamental solution of the heat equation.

Nevertheless, our estimates can be stabilised, in order to recover the correct exponential decay in the $p = 2$ limit. However, this would require a careful tracing of all the functional dependencies in our estimates, and we postpone it to a future work.

References

[1] E. DiBenedetto, *Degenerate Parabolic Equations*, Universitext, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1993.

[2] E. DiBenedetto, U. Gianazza and V. Vespri, Harnack Estimates for Quasi-Linear Degenerate Parabolic Differential Equation, *Acta Mathematica, 200 (2008), 181–209.*

[3] E. DiBenedetto, U. Gianazza and V. Vespri, *Harnack's Inequality for Degenerate and Singular Parabolic Equations*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2012.

[4] E. DiBenedetto, U. Gianazza and V. Vespri, A New Approach to the Expansion of Positivity Set of Non-negative Solutions to Certain Singular Parabolic Partial Differential Equations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 138 (2010), 3521–3529.*

[5] F.G. Düzgün, P. Marcellini and V. Vespri, An alternative approach to the Hoelder continuity of solutions to some elliptic equations, *NonLinear Anal. (2014) 133–141.*

[6] F.G. Düzgün, P. Marcellini and V. Vespri, Space expansion for a solution of an anisotropic p-Laplacian equation by using a parabolic approach, *Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma, 5, (2014) 93–111.*

[7] T. Kuusi, The weak Harnack estimate for weak supersolutions to nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5),* **7***(4), (2008), 673–716.*

[8] V. Liskevich and I.I. Skrypnik, Hölder continuity of solutions to an anisotropic elliptic equation, *Nonlinear Anal. 71 (2009), 1699–1708.*